

REMARKS

Claims 13, 36, and 59 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 13-23, 36-46, 59-96 and 103-111 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 97-102 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 97-102 have been cancelled.

The Examiner has rejected claims 13, 36, and 59 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huitema in view of Wilson.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claim 13, Wilson teaches a domain tree with nodes that represent names of *domains* in Figure 4 and at 7:23-42. A domain tree as taught by Wilson is not the same as a *network* object tree as recited in claim 13. A network object tree includes a logically hierarchical set of network objects each associated with a *numerical* network designation, as clarified by the amendment to claim 1. For example, and without limitation, as shown in Figure 6 of the Application, network object 96 has a network designation "192.000.00.000" and network object 98 has a network designation "192.168.00.000". Support for the amendment to claim 13 may be found, without limitation, in the above-captioned application at page 11, lines 15-23 and Figure 6. As such, neither Wilson nor Huitema teaches that "the object oriented database comprises a network object tree that includes a logically hierarchical set of network objects each associated with a numerical network designation". In addition, neither Wilson nor Huitema teach that a "zone object tree and a network object tree are linked via a host object that is associated with the domain name and the IP address," as neither Wilson nor Huitema teaches such a network object tree. As such, claim 13 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 14-23, 70-78, and 103-105 depend from claim 13 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 36 recites program code for carrying out the method of claim 13. Therefore, it is believed that claim 36 is also allowable.

Claims 59 recites a system for carrying out the method of claim 13. Therefore, it is believed that claim 59 is also allowable.

Claims 37-46, 79-87, and 106-108 depend from claim 36 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 60-69, 88-96, and 109-111 depend from claim 59 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11-26-08

Clover Huang
Clover Huang
Registration No. 55,285
V 408-973-2594
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014